

Thank you for the additional minute.

As you recall, yesterday I made 2 points about the Kim et al paper: (1) the analyses was a 2 sample t-test on a subset of the collected that did not seem to match the published statistical protocol and the results are dependent on how the statistical analyses are done and (2) the published differences for FEV and FVC were statistically significant but not clinically significant.

I would like to point out that the same points apply to the Adams' papers and the EPA analysis of them. The Adams data were collected with the interim measurements, and based on conversations with Dr Adams, were intended to be part of the analysis – he recognizes the value of these interim data.

As a statistician I ask the Panel to please be very careful and critical of the statistical modeling and results from the chamber studies that are being considered. Please do not be seduced by the  $p$  value.

Thank you.

Mark Nicolich, PhD  
Statistician  
COGIMET  
24 Lakeview Rd  
Lambertville, NJ 08530

mark.nicolich@gmail.com  
609.397.4089